



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,287	07/18/2003	Rahul Saxena	P16855	4600
50890 7590 10/11/2007 CAVEN & AGHEVLI c/o INTELLEVATE P.O. BOX 52050 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			EXAMINER HUSSAIN, TAUQIR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2152	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

MN

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,287

Applicant(s)

SAXENA, RAHUL

Examiner

Tauqir Hussain

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to amendment /reconsideration filed on 08/02/2007, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended. Claims 28-30 are newly added to the previous set of claims and therefore, claims 1-30 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.
2. Viswanath have been cited as prior arts in the last office action. The teachings that applicable are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08/02/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that

- (a) Applicant argues that the word discarding over comes the word stripping.
- (b) Prior art clearly fails to teach (or even suggest) CRC related information".

As to applicant's argument (a), Examiner respectfully disagrees and quotes the dictionary definition for stripping is as "to take away or remove" and definition for discarding is "to get rid of or dispose" these definitions are substantially the same.

As to applicant's argument (b), Examiner respectfully disagrees would like to point out that the claim language does not commensurate with the applicant's argument. As per applicant argument it is not clear whether "CRC" itself is a CRC related information? Or CRC related information is inserted into the frame?

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the Claim limitation, "Discarding atleast a portion of the electronic data prior to providing the electronic data to a memory..." must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claim 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Viswanath et al. (Patent Number: 6151322), hereinafter "Viswanath".

8. As to claim 1, Viswanath discloses, a method of operating a network device, comprising:

receiving electronic data from a first port of the data networking device (Abstract, lines 1-2);

discarding at least a portion of the electronic data prior to providing the electronic data to a memory of the networking device Abstract, lines 3-10, where stripping the tag means discard the portion of the electronic data and Col.7, lines 10-13, where VLAN tag is extracted means discarded and only VLAN ID is stored with frame in a memory);

providing at least a portion of the electronic data to a second port (Abstract, lines 16-20, where transmitting port is the second port).

9. As to claim 10, an apparatus, comprising:

one or more receive ports capable of receiving electronic data from a network (Col.7, lines 10-11, where switch receiving packets on one of the ports);

one or more transmit ports capable of transmitting electronic data to a network (Col.7, lines 42-44);

a memory (Col.7, lines 12-13; and

a processor, the processor configured to, in operation (Fig.3, Element-70):

discard at least a portion of the electronic data received by the one or more receive ports (and Col.7, lines 10-13, where VLAN tag is extracted means discarded and only VLAN ID is stored with frame in a memory);

provide the remaining electronic data to the memory (Col.7, line 13);

read the electronic data from the memory (Col.7, lines 17-18);

modify the electronic data after reading from the memory (Col.7, lines 32-33);
and

provide at least a portion of the electronic data to one or more of the transmit
ports (Col.7, lines 42-44).

10. Claim 19, is rejected for the same reasons applied above to claims 1 and 10.

11. As to claim 2, Viswanath discloses, modifying the electronic data prior to said
providing Abstract, lines 3-5, where striping is modifying).

12. As to claim 3, Viswanath discloses, wherein the electronic data comprise a frame
(Col.1, lines 19-22).

13. As to claims 4 and 14, Viswanath discloses, wherein the portion of electronic
data deleted comprises a VLAN (virtual local area network) tag (Abstract, line 3).

14. As to claim 5, Viswanath discloses, wherein modifying comprises inserting a
VLAN tag to the frame (Abstract, lines 14-16).

15. As to claim 6, Viswanath discloses, generating a CRC (cyclic redundancy code)
and inserting the CRC into the frame prior to providing to the memory (Fig.4, Elements-
84 and 64, Col.7, lines 21-39, where comparator is CRC and modifying means adding
or deleting or inserting the appropriate information into frame and sending it to memory
64).

16. As to claim 7, Viswanath discloses, providing a portion of the electronic data to a control module prior to deleting a portion of the electronic data (Fig.4, Elements-84 and 64, Col.7, lines 17-21, where comparator 84 is control module, lines 32-33, where data is modified means deleting or adding header information and lines 37-39, where data is transferred to element-64, which is memory).

17. As to claim 8, Viswanath discloses, wherein the portion of data provided to the control module comprises the protocol header (Fig.1a and 1b, Col.3, lines 31-33, Inherently protocol header is there, e.g. VLAN type, source address, destination address etc.).

18. As to claim 9, Viswanath discloses, wherein the first port and the second port comprise a receive port and a transmit port, respectively (Col.7, lines 10, where receiving port could be first port and lines 42-44, where output port is transmit port).

19. As to claim 11, Viswanath discloses, wherein the processor is further configured to modify the electronic data prior to providing at least a portion of the electronic data to one or more of the transmit ports (Col.7, lines 42-44, where out put port is transmit port and VLAN insertion means the data has been modified).

20. As to claim 12, Viswanath discloses, wherein the apparatus comprises a network switch (Fig.2, Col.7, lines 10-11, where network switch means apparatus).

21. As to claim 13, Viswanath discloses, wherein said memory comprises network switch internal memory (Fig.4, Element-64 and 80).

22. As to claim 15, Viswanath discloses, wherein modifying the electronic data comprises inserting a VLAN tag, wherein the VLAN tag relates at least in part to the destination address of the electronic data (Col.7, lines 42-44, where VLAN tag is inserted as a destination address).

23. As to claim 16, Viswanath discloses, wherein the processor comprises a network processor (Fig.3b, Element-70, Col.6, lines 25-26, where network switch has decision making engine which is processor and since switch is a network device therefore, processor is a network processor).

24. As to claim 17, Viswanath discloses, wherein the memory comprises a plurality of memory devices (Fig.3b, Elements-32, 64 and 66, Col.5, lines 50-51 and 56).

25. As to claim 18, Viswanath discloses, wherein the plurality of memory devices comprise one or more of:

random access memory (Col.7, line 62) and

synchronous dynamic random access memory (Col.5, lines 7-9).

26. Claims 20-26 are rejected for the same reasons as applied above to claims 5, 4, 6 and 15-18 respectively.

27. As to claim 27, Viswanath discloses, wherein said processor is configured to modify said electronic data only if said second port is configured to recognize tags (Col.7, lines 10-13, where processor processes the tagged packets and lines 42-45,

transmitted to VLAN ports which means there are out put ports configured to handle tagged packets).

28. As to claim 28, Viswanath discloses,, further comprising, the processor is to generate a CRC of a non-discarded portion of the electronic data (Viswanath, Fig.4 Col.7, lines 10-29, where inherently destination tag is generated for the frame and not for the striped tag)

29. Claims 29-30 has same limitations as of claim 28 and therefore, are rejected for same rationale as applied to claim 28 above.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references, as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2152

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tauqir Hussain whose telephone number is 571-270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571 272 3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2152

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TH


BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

10/10/7